

**LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE  
TEACHERS' SALARIES**

**CAPITOL ANNEX ROOM 117  
514 W. JEFFERSON STREET, BOISE, IDAHO**

**September 10, 2007**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Co-chair Representative Robert Nonini. Other committee members present were: Co-chair Senator Robert Geddes, Senator John Goedde, Senator Denton Darrington, Senator Mike Burkett, Representative Scott Bedke, Representative Mack Shirley, Representative Shirley Ringo and Representative Jerry Shively. Representative Rich Wills was absent and excused. Staff members present were Maureen Ingram and Jennifer O'Kief.

Others present were: Superintendent Tom Luna, Jason Hancock and Tim Hill, State Department of Education; Reed DeMordaunt, Chairman, State Board of Education Committee on Performance-Based Compensation; Dr. Cliff Green and Teresa Molitor, Idaho School Boards Association; Sherri Wood, Jim Shackelford and Robin Nettinga, Idaho Education Association (IEA); Representative Anne Pasley Stuart, District 19; Dr. Wayne Davis, Superintendent, and Becky Hogg, Mountain View School District #244; Charles Shackett and Scott B. McDonald, Bonneville School District #93; Lloyd Knight, State Department of Financial Management; Phil Homer, Idaho Association of School Administrators; Harry Amend, Superintendent, Coeur d'Alene School District; and Anne Ritter.

**Jason Hancock, Deputy Chief of Staff, State Department of Education** said the current system for funding from the state support program is a result of Senate Bill No. 1560, 1994, which was passed to end the ongoing law suit. House Bill No. 1, passed in special session in August, 2006, shifted funding for M&O from property tax to the general fund.

**Mr. Hancock** gave an overview of the funding formula. He explained that the staffing formulas for teachers and administrators are based on support units, often referred to as classroom units, multiplied by staff allowance, multiplied by base salary, and multiplied by the experience/education index. From this calculation the state "salary-based apportionment" is determined.

**Mr. Hancock** explained that the staff allowance establishes that for each support unit the state will fund 1.1 instructional positions, 0.375 classified positions and 0.075 administrative positions. **Mr. Hancock** referred to Section 33-1004E, *Idaho Code*, which sets the base salaries

for instructional staff at \$24,623, administrative staff at \$35,816 and classified staff at \$19,783. He noted the provision in statute that no full-time instructional staff member shall be paid less than \$31,000. He further noted that the FY08 provision for a minimum salary of \$31,000 is a fully-funded teacher salary mandate. He said there is essentially an override that provides for additional moneys to be distributed to school districts for any teachers who are at a salary level under \$31,000.

**Mr. Hancock** referred to a teacher salary funding grid that illustrates graduating salary levels, based on experience and education, beginning at the base of \$24,623. This funding system only recognizes the number of years taught and the number of education credits earned. It does not reward teachers who perform additional duties or have multiple endorsements. **Mr. Hancock** stated, "This is just a funding system. Payment to teachers is negotiated locally."

**Mr. Hancock** explained the breakdown of the state-paid employee benefits for FICA, PERSI and unemployment insurance. Discretionary funds, received by the districts, is an amount equal to \$24,442 per support unit in this current year. Most of the money is spent for health insurance, utilities, and in some cases used to provide a higher salary or another teaching position.

**Senator Goedde** asked how many school districts have adopted the state system. **Dr. Cliff Green, Executive Director, Idaho School Boards Association**, said that the majority have and added that the master contract agreement is what really comes into play. How money is "pushed" out to teachers depends on a negotiated agreement with the union and the school board. **Senator Goedde** asked how many districts pay based on the teacher salary funding grid. **Jim Shackelford, Idaho Education Association**, said there were approximately thirty districts last year who used that process.

**Senator Burkett** asked why not just increase the base to \$31,000 instead of doing so through a salary schedule as shown on the grid. **Mr. Hancock** said that at the time the Legislature began addressing the issue of the minimum salary as separate from the base salary, Idaho ranked 49<sup>th</sup> in the country for beginning teacher salaries, but were around 30<sup>th</sup> in average teacher salaries. The actual salary schedules as they have been negotiated at the local level have continued to favor the more experienced teachers where beginning teachers have been paid very poorly. The Legislature felt it was important to raise the base to make it attractive for new teachers to come to Idaho. Also, setting the base at \$31,000 was more money than the Legislature had at the time. **Representative Shively** expressed concern that the state is giving the districts money based on the \$24,623 base, but are telling the districts to pay the minimum salary of \$31,000, which is creating an unfunded mandate. **Mr. Hancock** explained that this is a mandate but it also is a fully-funded one.

In response to a question from **Senator Goedde**, **Mr. Hancock** said that if there were a 10% across the board salary increase for teachers, the base would start to catch up with the minimum salary of \$31,000. On the other hand, if you were to apply 10% on the base and not provide any increase in the minimum salary, you would be providing pay increases for most teachers, but not

for the teachers in the early part of their career.

[A copy of **Mr. Hancock's** presentation is available in the Legislative Services Office.]

**Tom Luna, Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction**, distributed copies of a document entitled "Public School Support Program, Distribution Factor," showing the 2007-2008 appropriation and the 2008-2009 appropriation request. **Superintendent Luna** stated that this year's budget request is a 7.9% increase over last year's appropriation. This increase covers the request of \$50 million for an instructional career ladder program and an additional \$9 million for related employee benefits. Of the 7.9% increase, approximately 2% is represented as growth, but over half is to fund this career ladder. He referred to the handout which illustrates what the budget would look like relating to distributions for various programs based on the factor of providing this funding as a career ladder.

**Representative Bedke** asked if the instructional index had gone up or down for this year. **Superintendent Luna** said they were projecting that it will be flat, but will see some adjustments to this budget after the first of the year when the exact numbers will be known. This is also projecting a 275 support unit increase. In response to **Representative Nonini's** question, **Superintendent Luna** said that the 275 support units were reflected in the salary-based apportionment of \$793,772,000. He added that the 1% increase in administration and 3% increase in classified are also reflected in that figure. In response to **Representative Bedke's** question, **Superintendent Luna** said that the 3% is reflected in the base salary figure of \$18,648 for classified staff.

**Senator Goedde** referred to the state longitudinal data system line item, and asked how teacher incentive could be implemented without including that data. **Superintendent Luna** said that the longitudinal data system is critical not only for decisions made regarding a career ladder or pay for performance type of a plan, but for most of the decisions that they make in education. He said that at some point in the future, they would be making a presentation to the Legislature about the need for a statewide longitudinal data system and a fiscally responsible way to acquire and implement one.

**Representative Shively** referred to the classroom supplies line item, which provides for approximately \$350 per teacher for supplies. He explained that some of the departments, such as music and art were cut drastically; and others, such as English, were given more than needed. However, the funds are not transferrable. He suggested that at the elementary level, this was a good idea, but not at the secondary level and there needs to be more flexibility. **Superintendent Luna** said that they have received concerns that this plan had not been implemented according to the guidelines that had been provided. He said that legislative intent was to ensure that every teacher received a supply allowance of \$350. There will be an opportunity to address the issue this year and make changes as necessary.

**Senator Geddes** stated that, if he was understanding **Superintendent Luna** correctly, the intent

of the Legislature was to provide discretionary moneys to each classroom teacher, which is being carried out; however, in some cases, the districts have pulled back some of the funding that had traditionally been provided to those programs, resulting in the ensuing problems as mentioned. **Superintendent Luna** said that was accurate, and added that they are dealing with a few cases that have not been addressed satisfactorily. He said that the program needs to be implemented properly. Seventy-five percent of the money would be distributed that week and they expect districts to be compliant before the money is distributed.

In response to a follow-up question by **Representative Bedke, Tim Hill** with the State Department of Education said the distribution is based on actual full-time equivalency as opposed to the instructional staff allowance. If the district had hired additional people, they would still receive the allowances. In addition, it is pro rata; consequently, a half-time teacher would receive half of a share. It also goes to all sources, including federal positions. There is no teacher that will not receive a share.

**Senator Burkett** asked on what program or assumptions is the projection of the \$50 million for an instructional career ladder based. **Superintendent Luna** said that this figure is not intended for the current system but requires a new plan. It shows how a new plan would fit into a budget with an overall 7.9% increase, including an 8.5% increase for teachers. **Representative Ringo** commented that the districts were asked to come up with a career ladder plan about twenty years ago, which in the end, wasn't funded. She applauded the determination to go forward with this type of program, which will provide some very positive changes, in her opinion.

**Representative Shively** noted the problem of low Idaho teacher salaries compared with Wyoming teaching salaries that start at \$51,500 and maximize at \$79,000. He said we are generating good teachers who then move to other states; we need to do everything possible to keep our teachers here. **Superintendent Luna** commented that Wyoming had "hit the national resource lottery," which helped them in the allocation of their resources in education. He said that every day, requests are received from out-of-state teachers who want to teach in Idaho, and he believes this career ladder plan is a step in the right direction to improve the system and become more competitive with neighboring states.

**Senator Burkett** asked the Superintendent what he thought of the idea of providing the \$50 million to the district management teams and allowing them to individually provide innovative career ladder type programs. **Superintendent Luna** said that he believes that school boards could do this, but maybe this would not be the best use of the money. This type of procedure would require a lot more questions and ground work in order to get that kind of an idea passed through the Legislature. **Representative Nonini** said that it would be interesting to compare the test scores of Wyoming and Idaho students. He commented that, in his opinion, more money does not always equate to higher test scores.

[A copy of **Superintendent Luna's** handout is available from the Legislative Services Office.]

**Representative Bedke** presented House Bill No. 294 (RS17159C1) from the 2007 legislative session. He stated that the current system for funding teacher salaries does not recognize several of the market forces that would impact the decisions of potentially new and veteran teachers. He said that HB 294 was meant to initiate discussion that leads to crafting a system responsive to the market and that would attract potential teachers and result in higher marks for our students. HB 294 had a general "buy-in" among the executive and legislative branches. He believes that if the education community could come to a fully supported process, the competition for general fund dollars would be within reach.

**Representative Bedke** said that this bill basically set up an alternative grid that is based on the teacher's discretion to opt into an alternate system of compensation. It is also a career ladder plan. He explained that school districts now offer three types of contracts, Category 1, 2 and 3. Teachers who opt into track B, the alternative grid, would only be eligible for Category 1 and 2 contracts. The continuing contract Category 3 would not be offered to teachers who opted into track B. There would be multiple year contracts available to teachers, but they would have to meet certain benchmarks within the career ladder.

**Representative Bedke** went through the bill highlighting several main points. The base salary would start at \$34,000. There would be a \$3,000 increase at benchmarks in the career ladder, as they were attained. Once a teacher has been placed on track B, there is not an option for placement on track A. There is a provision for directing school boards to determine how many would qualify at the various benchmark levels. He noted that this plan must fit into the overall budget picture and needs to be somewhat predictable. There is a provision that school districts may designate up to 25% of their teachers who have attained specific benchmarks to receive funding, and then an additional 40%, depending on other specific criteria. Not more than 25% of teachers in school districts employing at least twenty teachers may be placed on track B in any single fiscal year. **Representative Bedke** noted that this provision was included in order to avoid a calculated \$77 million price tag if everyone was opted in.

**Representative Ringo** stated that she did not see a description of career ladder beyond what is currently being done. She commented that the meaning of the terms "tenure" and "continuing contract" are not the same. She asked why the teachers who would opt to have the continuing contract would not be eligible for the career ladder, or track B option. **Representative Bedke** explained that the function that he and others have tried to provide with the drafting of HB 294 was for a clearinghouse of ideas to take place. If "big" new money is going to be put into the public school system, there needs to be some basic changes, and suggested that some of the concepts and ideas that have been part of previous discussions need to be repackaged in such a way that will keep and maintain the votes necessary to implement and spend additional money for this kind of plan.

**Representative Ringo**, referring to the base salary of \$34,000 on track B, asked if it was the intent that every other position would be different and would be the multiplier times \$34,000.

**Representative Bedke** said that it would last for a while and that for anyone who would move

from one cell in A to the new cell in B, there would be a minimum of a \$3,000 "bump." **Representative Shirley**, referring to the section in the bill that would limit to 25% the instructional employees that could be placed on track B for any single fiscal year, asked if that meant that in subsequent years an additional 25% could be added and after four years, conceivably, all teachers could be on that track. **Representative Bedke** said that was the concept that was contemplated when the bill was drafted and if it were done this way, it would be \$19 million per year over the base as opposed to \$77 million in one year.

**Senator Goedde** asked if teachers who opted for track B could still participate in collective bargaining. **Representative Bedke** responded in the affirmative, but only to the extent that they would advance up to a Category 2 and to the extent that there was supplemental money. **Senator Goedde** said that he didn't see any more measurement of performance in this bill than with the existing grid. **Representative Bedke** said that there are performance benchmarks and new ones could certainly be added.

**Senator Burkett** asked if a situation could arise where cost of living raises could be applied to one track, but not the other. **Representative Bedke** said anything is possible. **Representative Burkett** further inquired that if Category 3 contract rights were eliminated, would there be another option provided for contract rights for these teachers, possibly similar to private industry. **Representative Bedke** said it could look exactly how you want it to look, whether it is an IBM or other industry model, or ITD model. He said that case law would also be a factor in driving districts on how to handle various cases.

**Senator Darrington** asked why career based incentives are being included with the discussion on continuing contracts. **Representative Bedke** said that he believes that there are enough people who feel that the continuing contract is part of the problem.

[A copy of RS17159C1, 2007, is available from the Legislative Services Office.]

**Reed DeMordaunt, Chair of the State Board of Education's Performance-Based Compensation Committee** said that most of the programs throughout the country are started at the district level. He referred to a University of Florida study that linked performance with achievement. According to the study, merit pay for instructors was found to equate to better test scores for pupils. Pay incentives for teachers had more positive effects on student test scores than such school improvement methods as smaller class size, or stricter requirements for classroom attendance. There were over 544 schools included in this study. **Mr. DeMordaunt** highlighted pay for performance models that have been used in Denver, Minnesota and Texas and described the components of each. He said that the Denver plan appears to have been effective and the data is just beginning to come in. He recommended work produced by the Milken Family Foundation and referred to the Milken website, [www.talentedteachers.org](http://www.talentedteachers.org) as a source of information.

After describing the components of a good model for teacher compensation, **Mr. DeMordaunt** turned to the question of what will work for Idaho, and with regard to salary, he said there are

two components, the base and the variable. The variable component to salaries addresses teacher performance based on three steps: (1) targeted individual student growth, (2) collaboration, and (3) professional responsibility.

Regarding student achievement, the value-added method is a reliable statistical method for monitoring, on a longitudinal basis, student growth. He recommended the "Bill Sanders" model. He addressed the concept of individual funding pools and noted that district principals at the administrative level are also included in this. Funding starts when a minimum of 50% of a teacher's students meet or exceed their projected growth. He suggested that there be at least \$2,000 in each individual funding pool in order for this to be an effective management tool. He noted that this would not work if a \$2,000 award were given to every teacher.

Regarding collaboration, **Mr. DeMordaunt** explained that excellence needs to be encouraged with individuals as well as groups working together. The groups/teams would vary among the needs that are indicated in each school district. He explained that professional responsibility is where districts may include a management component that may include a parent survey, a valid reliable and quantifiable employee evaluation, a decrease in sick days, or increasing student attendance. He noted that the number one factor affecting a teacher's educational success is the teacher's verbal and cognitive abilities, which are strong characteristics that the teaching profession needs to attract. He stated that some of the considerations for attracting those kinds of people that have the best propensity for success are knowledge and skills measurement and development of a staged career and mentoring process that would be linked to knowledge and skills.

In response to a question from **Representative Nonini** about the Denver teacher evaluation process, **Mr. DeMordaunt** said that it was a standardized process. That is not the case in Idaho where different districts use different evaluations; some are better than others. He said the evaluation process used in the Bonneville Idaho district is based on the one from Jordan Utah and is a good one, as is the Milken Foundation plan. **Representative Ringo** expressed concern that any type of progress made by students with at-risk behavior problems would not show up on a pay for performance measurement. **Mr. DeMordaunt** said that the beauty of value-added is that it looks at each individual student's growth. He referred to the University of Florida study that found the effect of these programs were strongest in schools with the poorest families. He said he would provide additional information about the value-added model.

**Senator Goedde** commented that one of the greatest fears of educators are unfair evaluations and asked how to teach principals to carry out evaluations in an equitable, business-like manner. **Mr. DeMordaunt** said that this would be done the same way as in the private sector. Principals need to be trained in order to provide a fair and objective assessment. **Senator Darrington** asked how you measure vocational education teachers and special education teachers as well as music, drama and art teachers. **Mr. DeMordaunt** said that, regardless of the child, growth is expected. How that growth is measured will be different in different areas. He said that as long as teachers design tests using value-added criteria, then value-added can measure growth regardless of the

subject or the area. **Senator Burkett**, referring to the suggestion of not giving a \$2,000 incentive to everyone, asked what percentage would achieve the incentive motivation. The answer was about one- third. **Mr. DeMordaunt** will make available additional information.

[A document entitled "Performance-Pay for Teachers," and **Mr. DeMordaunt's** PowerPoint presentation are available from the Legislative Services Office.]

**Jim Shackelford, Executive Director, Idaho Education Association (IEA)**, introduced **Sherri Wood, President, and Robin Nettinga, Director of Public Policy, IEA**, and then distributed copies of three documents: A PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Teacher Compensation: A report to the Legislative Task Force on Teacher Salaries;" and two documents entitled, "Knowledge and Skill-Based Compensation Framework;" and "Group-Based Performance Awards." [Copies are available from the Legislative Services Office.]

**Mr. Shackelford** said the view of the IEA, based upon the findings of their own task force, is that effective effort requires a substantial financial investment that will ensure that teachers view a plan as significant enough financially to impact their involvement in that plan. He said that the majority of teachers throughout the state see no relationship between the concepts of continued contract law or employment law and how teachers are paid. The IEA is very willing to talk about teacher contract law. He said that research shows that competition among teachers for scarce resources does not improve student performance. Teachers will change their methods when they believe the change will enhance their profession and their effectiveness with students.

**Sherri Wood** explained that the IEA believes that all educators should remain on the current salary system and adequate funding should be available for that system. Local school districts should be encouraged to implement an alternative pay plan based on a framework provided by the state. The state should provide additional funding to support the alternative system. **Ms. Wood** outlined the framework for the alternative compensation plan. The plan would be built around the current salary allocation of today which includes annual increases provided by the Legislature and local option funding. The new piece in this framework is called the Knowledge and Skill-Based Compensation, which recognizes three levels: novice, professional and master.

**Ms. Wood** explained the minimum expectations for each level. She also explained that requirements involved in transitioning from one level to another. At each level, the Local Professional Development Committee (LPDC) plays a role in either being part of the exit interview or approval process of a teacher's portfolio. Observation and evaluation of the educator would occur at all three levels, as outlined in *Idaho Code*.

**Ms. Wood** highlighted key points of group-based performance awards and the minimum requirements of such plans. She expressed the importance of educators continuing to work together collaboratively. **Mr. Shackelford** commented that he hoped this proposal would provide a basis for further discussion. He explained that an essential element of this concept is that teachers could remain on the current salary schedule or opt to move into an alternative plan,



which would include a set of options that would encourage teachers to delve more deeply into their work.

**Representative Shirley** asked if this proposal had been implemented in other states. **Ms. Wood** said that Douglas County in Denver, Colorado was the closest to the novice/professional/master's level type of plan. **Senator Burkett**, referring to the point made that all educators will remain on the current state system, asked if it would be fair to say that the alternative would be the current system "plus," as opposed to saying there are really two alternatives. **Mr. Shackelford** said that the IEA would say that the current system would continue to the extent that an educator could stay on the current system for the educator's entire career, or they could stay on the current system and then enter the alternative compensation plan and receive additional money for the additional piece. **Senator Burkett**, referring to the Denver plan, asked if there are teachers that do not opt into the additional supplemental program. **Mr. Shackelford** said, in Denver, the people currently have the choice. He believes all of the new hires enter into the new system.

**Representative Ringo** asked if the involvement of the LPDC (Local Professional Development Committee) is primarily at the transition time. **Ms. Wood** said that they would be involved as the professional development plan is being reviewed and also as the comprehensive plan is being developed. A mentor or LPDC member would continue to advise, assist and help to strengthen the professional development plans. **Representative Ringo** stated that the observation and evaluation process noted in each of the three levels would be a very important part of this discussion. **Senator Goedde** said that, in his opinion, it appears that this plan could be easily adapted on a pilot program that would allow individual districts to have a choice of accepting that challenge. **Ms. Wood** said that setting up pilot programs would be a possibility.

In response to **Representative Nonini's** question, **Ms. Wood** said that after much discussion, it was decided that the members of the LPDC would need to be made up of peers as well as the educator's supervisor and probably the principal. Depending on the school, it might look different, based on the local plan. **Representative Nonini** asked if the members would include school trustees or concerned citizens. **Mr. Shackelford** said that they had decided that the framework should be relatively general and the school district would decide who would be on the committee.

**Mr. Shackelford** highlighted qualities of a professional employment relationship. He said that teachers want clear and consistent procedures, an effective process of evaluation and the opportunity to correct deficiencies. There should be the opportunity for both sides to be heard in front of an impartial panel, and a timely and affordable appeals process if deemed necessary. He outlined recommendations for improvements to current law as follows: expedited appeals process; provisions for local hearing panel for dismissal and nonrenewal decisions; and provisions for increasing certification requirements and providing ongoing training opportunities for school administrators in the areas of employee evaluation and support.

Following a recess from 11:31 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., the task force reconvened, **Co-Chair Nonini**

presiding.

**Senator Geddes** offered his remarks regarding HB294, saying that some teachers like the concept, but some do not. There is fear among teachers that something might be added that they cannot accept, or that there won't be any change. He said this is not just about money, but about education and providing the very best there is to offer. **Senator Geddes** shared that in some instances, the cost to a school district to terminate a teacher has been between \$250,000 and \$500,000. He added that the cost is enormous to young people who are not affected in a positive way due to an inadequate teacher who, in his opinion, is a very small minority. He suggested considering a plan similar to the business model. The solution needs to be long-reaching in allowing children to have the benefit of being prepared to face the world and be able to contribute.

**Senator Goedde** expressed that the first consideration should be to decide, as a task force, if there is the willingness to put in the time that would be required to pursue this path. The next point to consider is whether to adopt this on a statewide basis or at the local level, within certain parameters on a pilot program basis. He stated that it would be easier to control the costs if done on a pilot project basis and it would not be as hard to back up if you go down the wrong path. **Representative Ringo** commented that the due process aspect means a lot to people and having the opportunity to be warned if the work is not satisfactory, and having the opportunity to improve, is very important. She commented that many administrators do not have the training or the time to go through a proper evaluation process and there is a serious breakdown if the proper role is not taken. **Representative Shively** commented that, in his opinion, increasing the salary by \$3,000 does not ensure better performance and better education.

**Representative Bedke** asked **Mr. DeMordaunt** to elaborate on the New York City experience he had referenced, where the principals were given the authority to terminate teachers, if necessary. **Mr. DeMordaunt** explained that the superintendent in that district had disallowed "bumping," which had allowed senior teachers to bump junior teachers; consequently the principals have been given more control over the teaching faculty in the district. There was impact on tenure as well. He said he would provide additional information.

**Representative Nonini** asked **Harry Amend, Superintendent of the Coeur d'Alene School District**, to share the evaluation process utilized in his district. **Mr. Amend** said that value evaluation in the Coeur d'Alene district is very standardized and is based on a walk-through model and a formal evaluation cycle model. The latter model is one where there is a pre-conference with a teacher, followed by one classroom observation and ending with a post-conference. They use the Charlotte Danielson model.

**Jim Cobble, Superintendent of the Jerome School District**, said their district had also adopted the Charlotte Danielson model. He said that no matter how effective the model is, it is no better than the people who are conducting the evaluation. He said they have used the counseling-out process if they have had to release an ineffective teacher. He stated that sometimes

ineffectiveness is hard to measure; unless you have data, it is difficult to see the growth.

**Mr. Cobble** said that one of the components to bring in quality people is an adequate salary. Another is the working environment, which is a district committed to reform and improvement. He said that the number of applicants for teaching positions is deteriorating yearly. He commented that a bigger factor is morale, and if people feel they are appreciated, they will thrive. **Dr. Wayne Davis, Superintendent of Mountain View School District in Grangeville**, said that the University of Idaho has assisted them in training their principals.

**Representative Shirley** said that during his experience as a principal, he counseled-out two teachers. He said that if teachers know they are not doing well, they are not happy and sense a lot of personal stress and turmoil. He said that throughout the state, some districts practice a good evaluation process and some are almost nonexistent. Teachers respond to incentives and the opportunity to improve. He questions what the \$3,000 above the standard salary schedule would accomplish. He believes people are entitled to due process. He stated that both HB 294 and the IEA proposals allow opportunity for achieving levels of growth and improvement. He acknowledged that HB 294 has tangible, fiscal guidelines; however, the cost is unclear in the other plans that were presented.

**Representative Nonini** suggested putting together a list of stakeholders. **Senator Darrington** said that it is a known fact that teachers will have good years, where a lot of students excel and bad years where fewer excel. He said that test scores over time, not on a yearly basis, may indicate in the long run that progress is being made. He said that they need to be cognizant of not creating animosity between the group that chooses to opt in and the one that does not. He said that consideration should be given to the fact that not every moment in the classroom is a teaching moment.

**Representative Ringo** asked **Mr. DeMordaunt** about the complexity of putting the value-added plan together. He said that Idaho was in a good position to implement the plan because Idaho already has ISAT data, which can be plugged into the value-added model. He explained that value-added is an analytical tool and not an actual test. It is a tool where data is added from the ISAT test or any other test that meets a certain criteria. The data is analyzed and the growth projected and then those projections compared at the end of the year. **Mr. DeMordaunt** will gather additional information.

**Senator Goedde** explained that value-added takes past performance that projects a growth curve on a disaggregated basis for each student; then in the classroom, you aggregate the expected growth curve and come up with a standard that a teacher should attain. If the class, as an aggregate group, exceeds that standard or projection, then that teacher has done better than the calculated expectation.

**Representative Ringo** expressed that she still had concerns when considering the at-risk or special needs students and some of the intangibles that wouldn't show up on any kind of

performance measure. **Representative Nonini** pursued the thought by asking how you would measure two 7<sup>th</sup> grade classes, for example, with one having a couple of autistic children and the other not. **Senator Goedde** said that was taken into consideration because the anticipated growth curve for that autistic child may not be as great as a child without autism. He reiterated that the expected growth curves are on a per student basis and are aggregated for the class; so the teacher, then, has a goal for that class. That goal may be different than the teacher teaching next door with a different set of students, but you can still ascertain whether they have exceeded their expected goal or not.

**Senator Burkett**, referring to teachers who are counseled-out and those that are disciplined-out, suggested hearing from administrators from around the state who think the system is not working. He would like to know if there are other states that have tied pay for performance to the formal firing process and have made that connection statutorily and whether that has been successful. He suggested **Senator Goedde's** proposal of using a pilot project. **Phil Homer, Idaho Association of School Administrators**, commented that he still believes there is a concern that continued contracts can be a problem and believes it is an issue that needs to be addressed. **Dr. Green** stated that he sees a huge correlation between continuing contract status and compensation, and correlation of quality. To keep good teachers and eliminate others, you have to have flexibility with the continuing contract status.

**Senator Goedde** suggested, that if this effort moves forward, the issue of treating this as an individual segment, or a building/group segment or both should be considered. Regarding the concern of losing teachers, he suggested considering other aspects, such as mentoring, which is not direct compensation, but is part of a program.

**Mr. Shackelford** said that they believe that the identification of a problem with a teacher should be done as early as possible by the person who has responsibility for that, who is generally the building administrator. **Representative Nonini** asked if some of the reasons teachers are being counseled-out of the profession is due to lack of mentoring. **Mr. Shackelford** agreed that a presence of a strong mentoring program in the state would help in ensuring that teachers realize early in their career that they are either successful or they realize this is not the profession for them. **Senator Geddes** asked how many teachers are counseled-out of a job and reapply to another school district or another state. **Mr. Shackelford** believes that does happen. However, in his opinion, changing the continuing contract law would probably not change that situation.

**Mr. Cobble** commented that they have a very strong and aggressive mentoring program. He believes the first three years are critical and is a definite component in the success of education. **Mr. Shackelford** yielded to a question from **Representative Bedke** who asked if it is possible to "due process-up" a Category 2 contract to the point where we touch all of the due process bases that have been verbalized so far. The response was that if there is a system that would be put in place that meets those objectives, the IEA would be glad to work together and look at concepts to build a system that provides assurances to both the employer and employee. **Representative Bedke** referred to some of the terms in the IEA proposal, "clear and consistent procedures" and

"effective processes of evaluation," and stated that until there were strict definitions that are applied uniformly across the state, "then you've got some cracks through which things are going to slip."

After brief discussion concerning agenda items for the next meeting that might include more information on value added models and contract law, **Representative Nonini** announced the next meeting of the task force has been scheduled for October 15, 2007, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.